



3 1223 06591 7412

DOCUMENTS

JUL 3 1974

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Youth and Education Committee Report for
adoption by the Human Rights Commission
of San Francisco

August 9, 1973

"Children sitting in classrooms who are unable to communicate in English, who cannot understand what transpires, must be a first priority of the San Francisco Unified School District. The Human Rights Commission urges that the entire school budget be re-examined in light of the pressing needs of today's education and that, perhaps, programs which were once considered important be postponed so that existing resources can be concentrated on emergent problems and that the needs of language-handicapped pupils be given a first priority."

Thus read the reports on Bilingual Education and Teaching English as a Second Language, released by the Human Rights Commission on February 11, 1970, and March 16, 1972 respectively. Despite budget and program increases annually since 1966, there are still children sitting in classrooms in 1973 who do not receive the language instructions they so

L12



cisco Public Library

Information Center
San Francisco Public Library
arkin Street, 5th Floor
nisco, CA 94102

ENCE BOOK

ken from the Library

Chinese - speaking children in San Francisco charging that offering instructions to overcome the language barrier by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Fall, 1973. This decision services the SFUSD would have offered.

lly three different methods for the instructions of English pupils. (1) Although the terms "Bilingual Education" are used, the method used for many pupils is the audio-English as a Second Language (ESL). Teachers who can speak English do use some of it in teaching but this varies class by class. The Chinese Bilingual Program, the Filipino Bilingual classes at Samuel Gompers High School are all ESL in Gompers, the ESL Program is generally "pull out" classes; that is, taking the pupil out of his regular class for special at least one period per day. The total number of students is 2,029. (2) The bilingual approach is to conduct a class in English. These classes are self-contained; that is, they are in these classes full time and subject matter as well as instruction is taught bilingually. As used in the San Francisco Bilingual approach includes an emphasis on the child's native culture as well as on his language. The Spanish Bilingual Program, the Mission Education Center, and Assembly Bill 116, passed by the California Legislature in 1972 to provide experimental bilingual programs, are bilingual. The total enrolled in these programs is 1,391. (3) A combination approach is Bilingual Support; that is, the course material is taught in English, but the teacher who is bilingual teaches in the pupil's native language to be supportive of the child. There is very little emphasis on the pupil's native culture. The Chinese Education Center and the Filipino Education Center are Bilingual Support; the total enrolled is 193.

Table I reports the Number of Students Enrolled in Bilingual and ESL Classes, 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1972-73. The number of pupils reported as receiving special English instructions reflects both students in full-time ESL or bilingual classes and some who receive only part-time instructions, who are pulled out of regular classes for a class period or more a day. It is not feasible to determine the proportion of those being served who are identified as non or limited English-speaking. Of the 736 elementary pupils enrolled in the Spanish Bilingual Program and the Spanish Bilingual Title VII program, 185 are English-speaking pupils who are enrolled in the programs as a part of the required ethnic balance. In the Spanish Bilingual Program, at the elementary level, 327 are ESL students whose primary languages is other than Spanish or English. Of the 272 at the junior high school level and 55 at the senior high school level in the Spanish Bilingual Program, 111 in the former and 2 in the latter are ESL students who speak other languages. Therefore, in the Spanish Bilingual and Title VII Program only 224 in elementary, 161 in junior high school, and 53 in senior high school are native Spanish speakers.

D



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

<http://archive.org/details/bilingualeducati1973huma>



3 1223 06591 7412

DOCUMENTS

JUL 3 1974

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Youth and Education Committee Report for
 adoption by the Human Rights Commission
 of San Francisco

August 9, 1973

"Children sitting in classrooms who are unable to communicate in English, who cannot understand what transpires, must be a first priority of the San Francisco Unified School District. The Human Rights Commission urges that the entire school budget be re-examined in light of the pressing needs of today's education and that, perhaps, programs which were once considered important be postponed so that existing resources can be concentrated on emergent problems and that the needs of language-handicapped pupils be given a first priority."

Thus read the reports on Bilingual Education and Teaching English as a Second Language, released by the Human Rights Commission on February 11, 1970, and March 16, 1972 respectively. Despite budget and program increases annually since 1966, there are still children sitting in classrooms in 1973 who do not understand English and who are not receiving the language instructions they so desperately need.

The suit filed by Chinese - speaking children in San Francisco charging that the schools are not offering instructions to overcome the language barrier will probably be heard by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Fall, 1973. This decision could affect the services the SFUSD would have offered.

There are essentially three different methods for the instructions of limiting English-speaking pupils. (1) Although the terms "Bilingual Education" and "Bilingual Program" are used, the method used for many pupils is the audio-lingual approach or English as a Second Language (ESL). Teachers who can speak the pupil's native language do use some of it in teaching but this varies class by class in an ESL Program. The Chinese Bilingual Program, the Filipino Bilingual Program, and the classes at Samuel Gompers High School are all ESL in nature. Other than at Gompers, the ESL Program is generally "pull out" classes; "pull out" refers to taking the pupil out of his regular class for special ESL instruction for at least one period per day. The total number of students in these programs is 2,029. (2) The bilingual approach is to conduct a class in the native language and in English. These classes are self-contained; that is to say, the children are in these classes full time and subject matter as well as language instruction is taught bilingually. As used in the San Francisco public schools, the bilingual approach includes an emphasis on the child's native culture as well as on his language. The Spanish Bilingual Program, the Mission Education Center, and Assembly Bill 116, passed by the California Legislature in 1972 to provide experimental bilingual programs, are bilingual. The total enrolled in these programs is 1,391. (3) A combination approach is Bilingual Support; that is, the course material is taught in English, but the teacher who is bilingual teaches in the pupil's native language to be supportive of the child. There is very little emphasis on the pupil's native culture. The Chinese Education Center and the Filipino Education Center are Bilingual Support; the total enrolled is 193.

Table I reports the Number of Students Enrolled in Bilingual and ESL Classes, 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1972-73. The number of pupils reported as receiving special English instructions reflects both students in full-time ESL or bilingual classes and some who receive only part-time instructions, who are pulled out of regular classes for a class period or more a day. It is not feasible to determine the proportion of those being served who are identified as non or limited English-speaking. Of the 736 elementary pupils enrolled in the Spanish Bilingual Program and the Spanish Bilingual Title VII program, 185 are English-speaking pupils who are enrolled in the programs as a part of the required ethnic balance. In the Spanish Bilingual Program, at the elementary level, 327 are ESL students whose primary language is other than Spanish or English. Of the 272 at the junior high school level and 55 at the senior high school level in the Spanish Bilingual Program, 111 in the former and 2 in the latter are ESL students who speak other languages. Therefore, in the Spanish Bilingual and Title VII Program only 224 in elementary, 161 in junior high school, and 53 in senior high school are native Spanish speakers.

Of the 247 elementary pupils enrolled in the Chinese Bilingual Title VII Program, 77 are English-speaking pupils who are enrolled in the program as a part of the required ethnic balance. In the Chinese Bilingual Program at the elementary level, 352 are ESL students whose primary language is other than Chinese or English. Therefore, 375 of the 3,613 pupils enrolled in all of the Bilingual Programs are primarily English speaking and 679 of the remaining 3,238 are ESL students whose primary language is other than Chinese, Spanish, English, or Tagalog.

When school children immigrate to San Francisco, they are placed in grade levels according to their age and are expected to compete with their English-speaking peers except when they are screened and placed through the Education Centers. An additional problem which faces Filipino children is that in some areas in the Phillipine Islands, children enroll in first grade at age seven. Therefore, these children are one year behind their age counterparts. Children are frustrated by their inability to understand the regular class work. The problem is particularly severe for those in the high school age group who do not have time to learn sufficient English before they reach the high school age limit or who quickly lose interest in school; most of these students never receive high school diplomas.

The most recent survey conducted by the San Francisco public schools to estimate the number of children who are non-English-speaking or limited English-speaking was completed in April, 1973 (Table II). The previous survey was administered in December, 1969. At that time, 5,260 were identified compared with 9,084 in the 1973 survey. A part of the very substantial increase may be due to improved identification methods. The new figures do reflect a need of substantial portion, especially when it is noted that 5,379 out of an elementary school population of 39,380 or 14.9% are limited English-speaking compared with 3,132 out of an elementary school population of 48,727 or 6.4% in 1969. It must be noted that the number needing ESL or Bilingual classes might be a conservative figure.

It is not possible to state precisely the portion of those needing English language instruction who are receiving it or conversely, those who need it but are not getting it. Since the April 1973 survey identified 9,084 as non English-speaking or limited English-speaking and 3,613 pupils are enrolled in the Bilingual Program, the need is at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than the number being served. When 375, the number of English speakers in the program for ethnic balance, is subtracted, 3,238 pupils are served. Because a formal referral list for entrance into bilingual classes is not in operation, it is not certain that all speakers of other languages in the Bilingual Program are among those identified in the April 1973 survey as non or limited English-speaking. Therefore, probably six thousand pupils in need are not being served; the need may be more than three times greater than the number being served.

The budget appropriated has increased substantially annually since the 1966-67 school year. The expenditures for each of the programs for the three language groups from 1966-67 through 1972-73 are shown in Table III (see attached). The bulk of the bilingual/ESL budget is not provided by Federal and State sources as is often supposed. In the 1972-73 total budget for the Bilingual Program of \$2,374,873; \$1,418,084 came from the SFUSD and \$986,789 was from Federal sources: (The Emergency School Assistance Program, the Emergency Employment Act, the Mission Coalition Organization, and Elementary Secondary Education Act, Title I). Expanded in-service teacher training will be funded through California State Assembly Bill 2884. In the 1972-73 school year, \$43,000 was provided for expanded in-service training; additional funds will be available in the 1973-74 school year. ESAP has been replaced by the Bilingual apportionment of the Emergency School Assistance Act which provides \$318,881 for the 1973-74 school year. Mission Coalition Organization money will definitely not be available. The decisions regarding funding the Emergency Employment Act and ESEA Title I have not as yet been made for the 1973-74 school year. The funding levels under Title VII and Assembly Bill 116 will be somewhat lower in 1973-74 than in 1972-73.

The San Francisco Board of Education is to be commended for its increased funding of programs serving the non native English-speaking pupil, though more is needed. School District staff, coupled with broad-based community support, is to be commended for its success in obtaining Federal and State funding, though this support is grossly insufficient. The end result of this increased funding is that many more pupils are receiving the special instruction in English which is essential to their functioning in school and in society.

3 1223 06591 7412

Despite the marked progress which has been made to date, many more students have been identified and are waiting to be helped; still more pupils will undoubtedly show a need for ESL or bilingual instruction. The preliminary 1973-74 school budget includes no new budgeted positions nor programs, and does not allow for funding those Federal programs which might not be refunded in 1973-74. As the San Francisco public schools are presently financed, it does not seem feasible for the District budget to carry the totality of the funding for non native English-speaking pupils. State and Federal money has been directed at pilot or demonstration projects and not at meeting the overwhelming need on a continuing basis. Efforts must be directed at changing this strategy.

The Human Rights Commission of San Francisco urges the San Francisco Unified School District to make the Bilingual Education Program a major priority. Comprehensive planning, in close cooperation with a multi-ethnic advisory committee, must be developed so that program expansion can be in the direction of greatest need, rather than responding to external pressures.

Planning should entail actively seeking funds to meet identified needs; funds are to be sought from SFUSD as well as from Federal and State sources. Also planning must ensure that non English-speaking pupils have first priority for vacancies in bilingual or ESL classes. As a means of reducing costs and increasing service, it is recommended that there be expanded use in bilingual and bilingual support classes of self-contained classrooms staffed by bilingual/bicultural teachers. Even given the freeze on hiring, aggressive recruitment of bilingual/bicultural teachers and paraprofessionals, and more aggressive pursuit of provisional credentials, remain to be done. To improve the effectiveness of existing classes, articulation must result in coordination between grade levels and among classes, so that valuable class time is not lost in adapting to teaching methods or in relearning previously learned materials. Competent evaluation must be mandated to measure program effectiveness in teaching English and increasing pupils' sense of self-worth as a function of primary language and degree of language proficiency so that decisions can be made in terms of what works. Also included in the evaluation should be a method for determining when the pupil should be transferred to regular classes. A collateral advantage of Bilingual Education which must be considered in any evaluation is the reciprocal cultural enrichment learning experience provided by non English-speaking pupils and those for whom English is their native tongue. Only by working at all of these levels can the needs of limited English-speaking pupils be met.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN BILINGUAL AND ESL CLASSES:

	* Chinese Program	1970-71	71-72	72-73	* Spanish Program			1970-71	71-72	72-73	Filipino	1970-71	71-72	72-73	Total
					1970-71	71-72	72-73								
Elementary															
Bilingual	-	133	247	332	519	817	20	-	-	60	352	652	1,124		
ESL	<u>406</u>	<u>836</u>	<u>1,101</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>616</u>	<u>1,166</u>	<u>1,282</u>			
Total	406	969	1,348	482	700	817	80	149	241	968	1,818	2,406			
Junior High															
Bilingual	-	-	-	240	271	272	-	-	-	-	240	271	272		
ESL	<u>681</u>	<u>554</u>	<u>536</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>726</u>	<u>625</u>	<u>628</u>			
Total	681	554	536	285	271	272	-0-	71	92	966	896	900			
Senior High															
Bilingual	-	-	-	-	-	-	55	-	-	-	-	-	55		
ESL	<u>129</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>252</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>213</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>373</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>252</u>			
Total	129	94	252	178	213	55	66	87	-0-	373	394	307			
Grand Total	1,216	1,617	2,136 *	945	1,184	1,144 *	146	307	333	2,307	3,108	3,613 *			

* The number of pupils enrolled includes 375 English speaking pupils included for ethnic balance and 679 ESL pupils whose language is other than the language indicated.

TABLE II

1973 CENSUS REPORT OF NON-AND LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS:
Teacher Opinion Survey, April, 1973

Chinese

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	232	1,768	2,000
Junior High	138	533	671
Senior High	66	720	786
TOTAL	436	3,021	3,457

Spanish

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	295	1,642	1,937
Junior High	140	343	483
Senior High	15	545	560
TOTAL	450	2,530	2,980

Filipino

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	99	1,057	1,156
Junior High	11	194	205
Senior High	14	144	158
TOTAL	124	1,395	1,519

Japanese

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	16	102	118
Junior High	9	20	29
Senior High	0	55	55
TOTAL	25	177	202

Samoan

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	7	144	151
Junior High	4	6	10
Senior High	0	18	18
TOTAL	11	168	179

Others

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	93	425	518
Junior High	41	114	155
Senior High	0	74	74
TOTAL	134	613	747

Summary

	<u>Non-English Speaking</u>	<u>Limited English Speaking</u>	<u>Total</u>
Elementary	741	5,138	5,879
Junior High	343	1,205	1,548
Senior High	95	1,556	1,651
TOTAL	1,180	7,904	9,084

TABLE III

BILINGUAL EDUCATION/ESL BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
CHINESE							
Chinese Bilingual Program (ESL)	-0-	\$88,016	\$280,459	\$280,460	\$343,892	\$392,131	\$637,575
ESEA Title VII, Chinese	-0-	-0-	-0-	51,500	240,028	288,985	326,000
Chinese Education Center	-0-	-0-	-0-	100,000	110,570	151,728	150,605
Elementary-Secondary Budget	190,000	190,000	200,000	230,000	50,000	-0-	-0-
AB 116, Chinese Bilingual	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	82,370
	190,000	278,016	480,469	631,969	744,450	832,845	1,196,550
TOTAL CHINESE							
FILIPINO							
Filipino Bilingual Program (ESL) (Included in Spanish Bilingual Program 1966-70)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	21,651
ESEA Title VII, Filipino	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Filipino Education Center	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	112,937
Elementary-Secondary Budget (Included in Spanish 1966-70)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	222,245
TOTAL FILIPINO							
SPANISH							
Spanish Bilingual Program ESEA Title VII, Spanish	-0-	41,133	248,699	274,069	346,031	247,153	615,353
Mission Education Center	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	292,901	365,258	196,394
Elementary-Secondary Budget	-0-	20,000	80,000	100,000	-0-	139,867	143,331
	-0-	61,132	328,699	374,069	100,000	60,000	-0-
TOTAL SPANISH							
TOTAL BUDGET							
	190,000	339,149	809,168	1,036,038	1,463,421	1,790,772	2,374,373

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

SUMMARY OF BILINGUAL PROGRAM FOR 1972-73

Data Source: Bilingual Education Dept., SFUSD
February, 1973

PROGRAMS	STUDENTS BEING SERVED			NUMBER OF TEACHERS			NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS			BUDGET			PROGRAMS	STUDENTS BEING SERVED			NUMBER OF TEACHERS			NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS			BUDGET		
	E	JH	SH	DIST	ESAP	MC0	EEA	FED/STATE	DIST	ESAP	MC0	FED/STATE		E	JH	SH	DIST	ESAP	MC0	FED/STATE	DIST	ESAP	MC0	FED/STATE	
<u>CHINESE BILINGUAL (ESL)</u>	968	506	252	E=22	-	-	E=1	-	-	E=1	-	-	E=29	570	455	-	-	40,000	27,120	-	-	40,000	27,120	-	
<u>SPANISH BILINGUAL</u>	536	272	55	E=18	-	-	E=7	E=2	-	E=5	JH=1	SH=1	E=3	JH=5	SH=3	E=17	462	346	-	40,000	15,520	97,187	40,000	15,520	97,187
<u>FILIPINO BILINGUAL (ESL)</u>	181	92	-	E=1	E=1	JH=2	E=1	-	E=5	JH=1	SH=1	E=10	E=5	-	E=17	462	346	-	8,185	22,105	5,000	8,185	22,105	5,000	
<u>FILIPINO ED. CENTER (BIL SUPPORT)</u>	60	-	-	E=1	E=2	-	E=1	-	E=3	-	-	E=3	-	-	E=4	74,018	-	-	74,018	-	-	74,018	-	-	
<u>CHINESE ED. CENTER (BIL SUPPORT)</u>	133	-	-	E=9	E=2	-	-	-	E=1	-	-	E=1	-	-	E=1	38,070	-	-	38,070	-	-	38,070	-	-	
<u>MISSION ED. CENTER (BIL BILINGUAL</u>	81	-	-	E=4*	E=3	-	-	-	E=2	E=2	-	E=2	E=2	-	E=1	123,931	-	-	123,931	-	-	123,931	-	-	
<u>SPAN. TITLE VII BILINGUAL</u>	200	-	-	E=8	-	-	E=2	-	E=2	E=2	-	E=2	E=2	-	E=2	26,674	-	-	26,674	-	-	26,674	-	-	
<u>CHIN. TITLE VII BILINGUAL</u>	247	-	-	E=8	-	-	E=2	-	E=3	E=2	-	E=2	E=2	-	E=1	68,964	-	-	68,964	-	-	68,964	-	-	
<u>A.B. 115 CHINESE BILINGUAL</u>	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	E=6	E=4	-	E=9	E=3	-	E=6	196,894	-	-	196,894	-	-	196,894	-	-	
<u>SUB TOTALS</u>	2406	900	307	E=64	E=8	E=5	E=9	JH=2	JH=2	E=17	JH=4	SH=6	E=27	E=5	E=15	JH=2	525,264	1,418,084	64,745	102,184	525,264	1,418,084	64,745	102,184	
<u>GRAND TOTALS</u>	3,613			149			71			80			80			80			80			80			

* includes 3 junior high school teachers in Spanish Bilingual and 2 elementary teachers in the Mission Education Center who were added in March 1973 following the arrival of Nicaragua earthquake refugees. The salaries of these teachers are not reflected in the budget 1972.

